

VOLUME 29

NUMBER 11

PRICE 25p

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for November, 1988

JESUS, FOUND

MINISTERIAL C

APOSTOLIC LE

THE CENTRAL

HAS JOHN PA

WANTED : THE

TWO POEMS

THE FUNDAMENT

le Holy Father

Farley Clinton

George Kelly

Angela Grimm

The Editor

Ada George

Thomas Mahony

Property of
Graduate Theological Union

DEC 13 1988

We are approaching our busiest time of the year; which begins in December. It would be the greatest help, therefore, if November renewers would renew without delay; also, if those few in previous months, who have not yet replied to reminders, would be so kind as to do so. The postal strike played Hell with our mail. We are still feeling its effects. Help us now, please, to be rid of them.

With so many thanks to you all.

—*Paul Crane, S.J.*

PLEASE NOTE

That any book mentioned in this or other issues of *Christian Order* is obtainable from :

Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop,
4, Brownhill Road,
London SE26 2FJ : UK.

and

Carmel of Plymouth,
1, Grenville Road,
St. Jude's,
Plymouth: UK.

Contents

Page

514 GET TO IT *The Editor*

516 APOSTOLIC LETTER:
A TURNING POINT
Farley Clinton

520 THE CENTRAL ISSUE
Mgr. George Kelly

533 JESUS, FOUNDER OF THE
MINISTERIAL CHURCH
Pope John Paul II

537 WANTED: THE COURAGE
TO ACT
The Editor

545 TWO POEMS
Mary Ada George

547 ATHANASIUS CONTRA
MUNDUM
Monica King

551 THE FUNDAMENTALISTS
Fr. Thomas Mahony

562 HAS JOHN PAUL SOLD
OUT?
Angela Grimm

573 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.
A. N. Other

If You Change Your Address:

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£10, \$20
Australia—£12, \$25
New Zealand—£12, \$25

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 29

NOVEMBER

No. 11

Get to It

THE EDITOR

THERE is a point to this Editorial, which I feel I have to make, even at the risk of seeming to some readers merely repeating what I have said in my Editorials for August/September and October. Let me assure them that there is no repetition here. There is emphasis, but emphasis is not repetition; and the emphasis seems to me particularly necessary now, if only to draw attention to an article in the *Wanderer* which has just come my way. It is by that excellent American Catholic journalist, Farley Clinton, who is a good friend of mine. I am not publishing this Editorial simply because he is a friend. No way; I am Publishing this Editorial because in his article which follows, he draws attention to the very sound opinion of Jean Vandrisse, writing from the Vatican, in *Le Figaro* which claims to be France's leading daily newspaper. This is what Vandrisse writes amongst other citations, also to be found in Farley's article :

"John Paul II's apostolic letter (*Ecclesia Dei*), issued as a *motu proprio* — a legislative act undertaken and published by the Pope on his own initiative, and in virtue of his apostolic authority—from which I shall cite the chief passages, will without doubt remain a major document, in some way marking a turning point in his regime".

Vandrisse proceeds to enlarge on this point and Farley Clinton cites the quotations from the *Figaro* article, which

illustrate this enlargement. There follows a quoted headline from *Le Monde*, the other leading French daily paper. It runs as follows:

"The Pope demands that the Bishops 'Make Communion Easier' with the Traditionalist Catholics".
The argument then follows the same line as that taken in *Le Figaro*.

What, then, have we here, contained within Farley Clinton's article? According to him, in his article which follows this Editorial:

"It (*Le Figaro*) understood the Pope's words as, in effect, giving victory to Lefebvre or at least to much of what he represented, even at the moment when he seemed to fail; committing the Pope to unambiguous support of the 'just aspirations' of Catholic traditionalists."

What, then, have we to do? Refuse, surely, to let die the Pope's Apostolic Letter, *Ecclesia Dei*: let me remind you again that a *motu proprio* is "a legislative act undertaken and published by the Pope *on his own initiative and in virtue of his apostolic authority* (italics mine—the Editor)" and described by Jean Vandrisse as "a major document, in some way marking a turning point in his (Pope John's) reign".

Here, then, you have in this Apostolic Letter what I have described in my October Editorial as a "Traditionalists Charter". It is for us all to act on its terms without delay; pressing with courage and perseverance — which, in the light of the Holy Father's words, we have every right to do—particularly for the restoration of the Tridentine Mass, which is our most precious heritage. In the words of Cardinal Lustiger of Paris, in a sermon preached on the occasion of his celebration of the first Tridentine Mass in Notre Dame Cathedral since November 30th, 1969, "the only serious question in the tragic Lefebvre affair is that of submission to the Pope —"it is not that of the ancient rites, which we all love".

Let us get to it then *without delay*. In the light of the Holy Father's command, there is no reason on God's earth why we should ever take "No" for an answer.

The Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II, referred to in this article, is known as *Ecclesia Dei* and was published on July 2nd of this year, 1988. The *Osservatore Romano* English translation of this letter was published in the October issue of Christian Order. Acknowledgements and thanks to the *Wanderer* for the article that follows.

Apostolic Letter : A Turning Point ?

FARLEY CLINTON

POPE John Paul II's formal command to all Bishops to treat those, who desire the preconciliar liturgy, as good Catholics and to assist them in every way to achieve their "just aspirations", has been interpreted by the leading French newspapers as a major event, perhaps a turning point in his Pontificate.

The Pope's order was delivered in his *motu proprio*, *Ecclesia Dei*, which was made public at the Vatican on July 2nd.

Although the immediate occasion of the *motu proprio* was the schismatic consecration of bishops by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre on June 30th, it is said to represent the culmination of more than nine years' close study by the Pope and his advisers of Catholics who have criticized, and in some cases resisted, many liturgical changes.

Writing from the Vatican, Joseph Vandrisse said in the July 4th issue of *Le Figaro* (which claims to be "the leading daily newspaper in the nation"): "John Paul II's apostolic letter, issued as a *motu proprio* — a legislative act undertaken on his apostolic authority — from which I shall cite the chief passages; will without doubt remain a major document, in some way marking a turning point in his reign".

Among the Pope's statements which especially struck *Le Figaro* were these:

"The movement promoted by Archbishop Lefebvre could be and should be the occasion for all faithful Catholics to make a sincere reflection on the subject of their own fidelity to the tradition of the Church. . . . All should acquire a new and practical conviction of the need to improve their fidelity still more, rejecting false interpretations and arbitrary applications or abuses in regard to doctrine, liturgy, or discipline.

"Above all it rests upon the bishops . . . to exercise the sharpest vigilance. . . . It means that all the pastors, and all the faithful, should obtain a new realization not only of the legitimacy but also of the richness that is given to the Church by the diversity of charisms and of traditions, with regard to spirituality and the apostolate, which constitute the beauty of unity in the truth.

"I desire to draw the attention of theologians (to the fact that) an extension and a deeper understanding of the teachings of Vatican II demands . . . an emphasis on the continuity of the Council with tradition, especially in questions of doctrine . . . a point not yet well understood in certain parts of the Church. . . .

"To all faithful Catholics who feel themselves at one with some earlier forms of the liturgy or Church discipline, in the Latin tradition, I also desire to make clear my determination — to which I demand that the Bishops and all those who exercise any pastoral ministry in the Church shall join themselves—to make membership in the Church easy for them, by means of such measures as may be necessary to secure respect for their just aspirations".

Saying that "above all the spirit of those who feel themselves bound to the Latin liturgical tradition ought to be respected", the Pope then directs, as a practical matter, that his indult of Oct. 3rd, 1984—by which he restored the Tridentine Mass in the Church and authorized the use of the missal of 1962—should be given a "large and generous application". This certainly demands a great change in the United States, and in other countries where the Bishops have deliberately kept the old Mass well hidden, difficult to find, practically unknown to multitudes who might be drawn to it.

With regard to the possible reconciliation of Archbishop Lefebvre and his followers, and the future status of those who have refused to adhere to Lefebvre's schismatic action, the Pope has established a commission which will act, he says, "in the light of the protocol signed on May 5th by Cardinal Ratzinger and Archbishop Lefebvre". This agreement was abhorrent to Modernists who accused the Pope of surrendering completely to Archbishop Lefebvre's wishes on every point, except the consecration of the four men he had selected to become bishops.

In a series of speeches on the days preceding and following the schismatic consecration, the Pope seemed to say that he wished to be bound by the agreement of May 5th. *Ecclesia Dei* has made this official.

Le Figaro ran quotations from *Ecclesia Dei adflicta* under the headline: "A Text Without Ambiguity". It understood the Pope's words as, in effect, giving victory to Lefebvre or at least to much of what he represented, even at the moment when he seemed to fail; committing the Pope to unambiguous support of the "just aspirations" of Catholic traditionalists.

Vandrisse remarked several times how the Pope's words made his intention absolutely clear. "Extremely clear, strong, and precise", he wrote, particularly with reference to the decision to remove all difficulties that confront those who dislike the new liturgy and to insist that all Bishops, and those who carry on any pastoral work, go along with him. The Pope's intention to bind the whole Church was clear, Vandrisse said, from the Pope's declaration that he is acting "in virtue of his apostolic authority".

The other leading French daily, *Le Monde*, ran the story under the headline: "The Pope Demands That the Bishops, 'Make Communion Easier' With the Traditionalist Catholics".

It selected most of the passages already quoted as the most important and representative of the Pope's letter.

As an obvious example of what the Pope is calling for, the Archbishop of Paris, Jean Cardinal Lustiger, celebrated the Tridentine Mass on July 3rd in the great Cathedral of Paris, Notre Dame. He said it in the place of a Latin

Mass, according to the ritual of Paul VI, offered every Sunday in the ancient Cathedral.

It is understood that Cardinal Lustiger said the old Mass at the personal desire of the Pope. The attendance for this Tridentine Mass was more than twice what is usual and filled the Cathedral to bursting. It was the first occasion since Nov. 30th, 1969 that the Mass of St. Pius V has been celebrated at Notre Dame: the feast celebrated (transferred from June 29th) was that of Saint Peter and Paul. In his sermon, the Cardinal said the only serious question in the Lefebvre affair is that of submission to the Pope —“it is not that of the ancient rites, which we all love”.

HOLY LAND : PILGRIMAGE

1989

April 2nd - 11th

Departure from Heathrow.

Some days in Jerusalem and remainder by Sea of Galilee.
Interesting tours: 3-star hotels; Guides; Spiritual Director travels with Group.

£439 inclusive.

Details : **SAE to Ave Maria Apostolate,**
P.O. Box 80, Southall, Middlesex UB1 1TL

Phone : 574 1621 645 7214

With his customary clarity, Mgr. George Kelly of the United States puts before Catholics the basic question which each must put to himself and answer today.

The Central Issue

MGR. GEORGE KELLY

WHEN Hans Kung attacked Cardinal Ratzinger for the doctrinal positions the Roman Prelate articulated in the *Ratzinger Report* and Hans Urs von Balthasar proceeded to dismiss Kung as unworthy of attention on the ground that "he no longer is a Christian", the post-Vatican II doctrinal disagreements among Catholic scholars finally found their proper framework. In this face-off no one rose to defend Kung for his "liberal" Catholicism and the press reports at least avoided putting Balthasar down as a "conservative" theologian or as a "Catholic fundamentalist".

Customarily, in recent years, these religious conflicts, have been depicted in political terms, right against left, tradition versus modernity, authority frustrating freedom, or Roman domination of particular churches. It should be clear, however, to anyone seriously observing the Catholic scene that political labels hardly explain the hardened doctrinal positions. Certainly not the hostilities over the differences. If mere politics explained the crisis, those differences would have been resolved years ago.

No, the items in controversy these past twenty years between Rome and some of its well-publicised theologians have to do with Catholic belief. At times with unbelief or half-belief (lightly called "pick and choose Catholicism"). When Hans Kung reduced his fight with Ratzinger (and with John Paul II) to "freedom of thought, of conscience, of doctrine", he revealed the bottom line for dissenters.

Ratzinger and Balthasar, on the other side, stand with Rome not because of politics, but because they see the central issue in the Catholic crisis to be "the truth" of the Catholic faith. Paul VI reduced the critical question to one, when speaking ten years ago to preachers : "Do you really

believe?" It was not a new question. In those very words Christ confronted his Twelve the night before He died : "Do you really believe?" (John 16,13)

Here is the issue in controversy which must be squarely faced. No great venom was displayed in the American Catholic body when the liturgy was popularised nor when the penitential discipline was eased, nor when minor saints were demythologised. Even the modernisation of religious life would have been well received had it proceeded in accordance with the intent of those Council Fathers who voted for *Perfectae Caritatis*. Ecumenical dialogue has received well nigh universal endorsement. The U.S. Church's belated involvement after 1965 in worldly concerns, four score years minus six after the Papacy's first modern social encyclical, would also have involved only minor scurrying between Catholic interest groups. By itself *Gaudium et Spes* would never have divided the Church in any serious way.

Not even the desire to fornicate more readily or to copulate contraceptively need have torn the Church apart. After all, Catholics have always contributed their fair share to high rates of wenching and at times to low birthrates. No, this time dissenters wished Catholics to copulate illicitly or contracept without confessing either as sin. The controversy grew hot when Church theologians used Vatican II as a cover to strip the Christian sexual ethic of its meaning and demands. The bottom line here was doctrine and the Church's faith in its truth.

Two years after the Council's end and one year before *Humanae Vitae*, the first Synod of Bishops (independently of Paul VI) zeroed in on the attacks on Catholic doctrine within the Church, concerned about the uncertainty being created for the faithful by certain scholarly writings. This Synod (October 28, 1967) feared, even then, that the issue had gone beyond the modernisation of theological expressions to "unwarranted innovations, false opinions, even error of faith." What errors of faith did the Synod Fathers have in mind? Not errors about sexual norms, but about Christ and his Resurrection, about Original Sin, the Moral Law itself, the Eucharist, the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the teaching authority of the Church itself.

It began to appear that Rome was back in the 16th century facing a new effort to strip the Church of its role as Christ's Mystical Body; and as his appointed medium of salvation for those who believed. Those, then, at the time, who reduced the Church simply to a meeting place for believers, set up their own churches without changing Catholic understanding of Christ and his mission one iota. But they also unleashed intellectual forces which, though willing to continue viewing Christ as an important symbol of the New Humanity, could just as easily do without Him; that is, if the Church insisted on identifying itself with the historical Jesus or with any alleged gospel which purported to be "the Word of God." The Reformation undertaken by Lutherans remained Christ-centred, Church-centred, but ultimately it spawned Modernism with its stress on religion more as human experience, than as response to God's Revelation. The Modernist Church was redesigned to be a Congregation of Religionists searching for "the divine" in human life, not a House of God guiding and directing "believers" to Christ's promised eternal salvation. In such a scenario a church, any church, simply became another human aggregation and, if the truth were faced, without a serious obligation to the Christian tradition or even to Christ, since what is written about him in the New Testament was not seen today as history at all. As another human society, the Church and its leaders are entitled to no special respect.

THE CATHOLIC QUESTIONS

This old Protestant Revolution, revisited by some Catholic theologians during Vatican II, raised once more the old and radical questions. Do the doctrines considered by the Church as true statements of Christian Faith really conform to any objective reality? Do we have a reasonable basis as committed Catholics for believing that Mary is a Virgin, that Christ founded a Church, that he chose Peter as his apostolic primate? Surely these are fundamental beliefs of the Catholic Church. If the answers to those questions are not certainly yes, then the Church's ancient enemies were correct: She is a Great Deceiver and her catalogue of doctrines are nothing more than an amalgam of pious

folklore, mythical statements no longer adequate to shape the lives of modern mankind because they are not literally true as the Church has constantly insisted they are.

Catholics who attend Sunday Mass regularly come face to face with these challenges to their received Faith. Sometimes they come in the changed life styles of the clergy and religious they know, or from those who have abandoned their religious commitment, but mostly in observing what goes on in the Catholic schools to which they entrust their children. One nationally known Catholic layman recently wrote his bishop

"At the 'Follow Your Daughter's Schedule Night' at our High School, a priest teacher began his session with the parents by asking the question, 'Who established the Church; After a few people had answered that Christ had established the Church he contradicted them and explained that Christ did not establish the Church. Rather, He came to preach the good news. About thirty years after his death, his disciples realised that He wasn't coming back immediately, so they began the organisational work of the Church".

Would to God that we have here an exceptional case, a freakish experience. Undoubtedly, the number of available scandals is legion, especially for those collegians, seminarists, novices and parents who have been and are being told that in Vatican II their Church gave up her claim to be the Church founded by Jesus Christ. One does not have to go beyond the most widely used theology or catechetical texts to find authors misleading the young on this important point of defined doctrine. The documents of Vatican II reaffirm the Catholic Church as the one, holy, apostolic and unique universal Church founded by Christ, with a hierarchical constitution given by Christ, whose bishops receive their authority from the Apostles, of whom Peter was the visible first head, to be succeeded later by the bishops of Rome, a Church which teaches infallibly through the bishops and pope, or through the pope alone. These doctrines have been declared true by the Church time and time again, along with the historical facts which undergird them. Twelve years ago (June 24, 1973), for example, Rome issued a "Declaration in Defence of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church Against Some Recent-Day Errors", yet those errors are still being taught in colleges and

seminaries. Is it any wonder that in the same year Archbishop Fulton Sheen remarked : "I tell my relatives to send their children to secular colleges where they will have to fight for the faith than to Catholic colleges where it will be stolen from them". It should not be surprising that only about one-third of our young Catholics go to Mass weekly with 75 per cent of them rejecting the Church's sexual ethic and the infallibility of the pope as well.

When my *Battle for the American Church* was published in 1979 two prominent reviewers decided the book was misnamed. There was no battle going on. There had been a revolution and it was over. Last year, Loyola University's Thomas Sheehan made a similar point. He charged that the present Catholic crisis was due not to the sexual revolution, nor to the revolt of religious and so forth, but to the rejection of Catholic doctrines and their historical basis by Catholic intellectuals, by those who now dominate Catholic higher education, including the formation of future priests. *Commonweal* thought well enough of the thesis to assemble a panel of fifteen scholars to pass judgement on its accuracy. While each juror reacted to Sheehan differently, not a single *Commonweal* respondent contested Sheehan's claim that the "Liberal Consensus" dominated Catholic higher education, including seminaries. What may be more significant yet is the fact that not a single *Commonweal* witness made any reference at any time to the Church's *magisterium* or its pronouncements on Jesus, Mary, and the origins of the Church, all of which were under heavy doubt from "the Liberal consensus" which, according to Sheehan, had triumphed in the Catholic academe. One commentator, California University's Jack Miles, claimed that the *de facto* choice already made by many good Catholics was in favour of *pious agnosticism*, viz., the maintenance of Catholic membership without necessarily knowing why.

THE DEFENCE OF DISSENT

Such deviance is defended in various ways, of course. As one Jesuit priest said recently : "The only thing that makes the only difference is, do we live life as his followers?" A Religious Brother told the press : "Teachers no longer require them (Catholic Students) to swallow, hook, line and sinker everything presented to them". Andrew

Greeley, considering the argument made by some that you have to accept the whole picture, retorts "That's not true". So the fashionable mind-set today, encouraged, taught, and tolerated, is "pick-and-choose-Catholicism", which at best is only half-belief, an exercise in Hans Kung "freedom of thought, of conscience, of doctrine". And while the choosing presently is directed at the faith of the Church, Christ himself is not excluded from being picked and chosen.

WHERE WOULD CHRIST BE ?

Why should anyone think that Christ would be content with half measures by disciples of the 20th century, when He demanded perfection of those of His own time in spite of what He called Moses' concession to human weakness (Mt. 19:1-12). He permitted a good rich man to walk away from His band since He refused to get rid of His wealth. (Mt. 19:16-22) To Peter's rejection of talk by Christ of his dying, Jesus gave the back of His hand, an answer he customarily reserved for his enemies : "Get out of my sight, you satan. You are not judging by God's standard, but by mans" (Mk 8:31-33). Does this sound like a "pick-and-choose" Messiah? Even when confronted by Pilate's "You are a king?" and every opportunity at hand for Him to equivocate, Christ said "yes". Though His kingdom was not of this world, this was why He was born—to bear witness to the truth (John 18:36-37). Speaking of the day of final judgement Christ said the sheep would be separated from the goats on the basis of how His followers cared for the needy (Mt. 26:31-41). Does this sound like a politician? Fifty years after Jesus Christ dies the disciple John in a biblical book called *Revelations* (the *Apocalypse*) recapped the Master's approach to the compromise of His gospel: "I know your deeds, I know you are neither hot nor cold. How I wish you were one or the other—hot or cold? But because you are lukewarm, neither hot nor cold, I will spew you out of my mouth." (Rev. 3:15-16) Even when he forgave sinners, and He did that readily, He stood fast on His teaching. The prodigal son had already asked forgiveness (Luke, 15) and to the adulteress (John 8,7) His final words were "Don't sin anymore".

God alone knows how many Christians hold on to their faith in Jesus with a modest appreciation of what it means.

Many are unfamiliar with all of its demands for mind and conduct. The "little ones", of which He spoke so often, were and are simple people, unlikely to know, let alone appreciate, the theological notes appended to particular doctrines. However, the John of the Apocalypse was speaking not to their kind but to influential leaders of the early Church who thought they were above the gospel. This John makes it clear that Christ did not take kindly to elite but halfhearted followers, especially those who scandalized the faith and good life of His "little ones". (Mt. 18:16)

We do not find in Christ, therefore, any precedent for the Church to condone comfort in half-belief or mediocre performance. We live with it, as He did, but the norms remain. (Only two years ago John Paul II reminded U.S. bishops that compassion for sinners did not mean indulgence of their sin.)

If we were to catalogue all the expressions used by Church Fathers since Vatican II to describe what has been known historically as "fidelity to the truths of the faith", to the "deposit of faith", to the "magisterium", we would need a complete concordance running to hundreds of pages. Even John Paul I — in his short pontificate of hardly a month — managed in his one session with U.S. bishops to speak of "fidelity to the doctrine of the Church".

DO YOU REALLY BELIEVE ?

So, we return to Christ's question in the Upper Room : "Do you really believe?"

We speak here not of faith in or out of eucharistic ministers, parish councils, base communities, academic freedom, collegiality, preferential option for the poor, not even of the freedom of particular churches. We are speaking of belief in the Catholic creeds and Catholic moral norms.

When, therefore, we ask "What do conservative Catholics want?" or "How do they see the future Church?", we are asking wrong questions.

They are wrong because they call for answers which have little to do with the eternal salvation of those for whom Jesus Christ died on the Cross, rose from the dead or for whom He established the Church. They are also wrong because they are political questions. "Right" and "Left",

"Conservative" and "Liberal" are French Revolutionary nomenclature invented to extol disturbers of the *status quo* or to denigrate establishment figures. In this kind of politics there is little regard for the true or the good, only the useful or the popular. Louis XVI lost his head in 1793 and his divine right too ("*mon droit*"), but Voltaire and company became right because it represented change. Whenever Catholic differences about creeds and moral norms are politicised in this way the Church suffers, because faith only knows what is true and false, good and bad, not what politicians or a given culture think about its content, especially those who do not acknowledge anything good or bad *per se*.

Were Barnabas and Justin Martyr in the early Church called "conservative" when they opposed state-approved abortion in pagan Rome? Was Arius "radical" when he refused to acknowledge Jesus as Son of God equal to God the Father? What about the modern Right Reverend New Dealer John A. Ryan who taught that contraception was intrinsically evil? Did Fr. John Courtney Murray become a conservative when he withdrew from public debates under orders from his Superiors? Or were these prominent figures merely good Catholics doing what the Church expects from men of faith? What about Jesus and His directives concerning faith, worship, obedience, civil duty and especially lust? Into what political category does He fall? Did not Christ speak only of faith and good works, of great faith and little faith, of doers of the word and sowers of evil? Christians *qua* Christians cannot be divided properly into right and left wing, not even into smart or not-so-smart Catholics. They are saints or sinners, the worthy and the unworthy, the practising and non practising. (As citizens they can be anything their enemies name them.) But to explain the present Catholic crisis in political terms or to think that any Catholic in good faith or in his right mind can seriously contemplate reversing an Ecumenical Council approved by four popes, is to compound, not alleviate, what is one more problem in a long list of faith difficulties that began with Jesus Christ himself :

"The words I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life."

"But there are some of you who do not believe".

"For Jesus knew from the outset those who did not believe, and who it was that would betray him.

"He went on 'This is why I told you that no one could come to me unless the Father allows him'.

"After this, many of his disciples left him and stopped going with him.

"Then Jesus said to the Twelve, What about you, do you want to go away too?

"Simon Peter answered, Lord who shall we go to?

You have the message of eternal life, and we believe!" (John 6:64-68)

In his 1975 tract on evangelization Paul VI made the same argument : the message of eternal salvation is such an absolute good "that everything else is subordinate to it". *This* is the gospel the Church preaches "especially to the poor who are often better disposed to receive it". *This* is the gospel message which may not be accommodated to the principles of other religious beliefs or of any compromise. *This* salvation is to be achieved "by self-denial and the cross", "by a total spiritual renewal of himself which the gospel calls *metanoia*", by "a radical change of mind and heart". (no. 10) Yet, it is this gospel, Paul VI says, "we are obligated to hand on and disseminate". *This* is what evangelisation means, what has been and is the essential mission of the Church from New Testament times, a task which cannot be carried on without the Church.

Dialogue with other religious bodies and with intellectuals, reinforced emphasis on the causes of earthly justice and earthly peace, collegiality and shared responsibility, renewed liturgy, updated religious orders—all objectives of Vatican II—by the same impetus demand the interior conversion of individual consciences and people's collective conscience as well (no. 18). *Aggiornamento* "will never achieve its full force and significance unless it is received, accepted, and adopted, and unless it evokes the whole-hearted allegiance of those who hear it" and unless, says Paul VI, there is fidelity to the Church and frequent reception of the sacraments (no. 23).

THE FUTURE CHURCH ?

How will the Church deal with the diminished faith, sometimes with the heresy, of its declining membership? What will the Church of the 21st century look like? Who can say? Wishing does not make predictions, anymore than dreams, come true.

First and above all, the Church will have to deal with its faith problems. She will have to clarify in this century again what does and does not belong to the Catholic faith. She will need to specify in plain language what is not acceptable. Even then, the Church does not control the uninformed or bad consciences of her flock. But precise teaching ends pretence about what Vatican II demands of Catholics—the old demands as well as the new. This may involve some old-fashioned biblical language—“thou shalt not”, “Woe to you if”, etc. However it is done, the Church must reestablish her identity as the Church of Christ. She cannot function effectively on any other basis. Indeed, without this doctrine clearly accepted as true by Catholics, at least by those who believe, all the words of the Church, and the works, are irrelevant. Even those causes of peace and justice in this world are the property of the Church only if She is Christ’s Church commissioned to preach his gospel to the poor and the needy. If she is not evangeliser, neither is she an alternative in worldly affairs to the State.

Secondly, the Church hierarchy will have to articulate her priorities better, especially the proper hierarchy of gospel truths, and in such a way that these priorities are not determined in the marketplace. Dialogue, consensus-building, participation, collegiality are not substitutes for Catholic worship, the reception of the Sacraments, and piety. Living by the first of all of God’s commandments involves development of formed consciences in obedience to God’s will and the laws of the Church. Our second commandment calling for charitable works on behalf of neighbours’ souls and bodies, preferential option for the poor, movements for peace and social justice — also demands that those who would grace the lives of the poor be themselves graced with virtue and a touch of holiness. The apostolate on behalf of the poor and the oppressed must be led by those filled with Christ’s message of conversion from sin and of eternal salvation.

Thirdly, the Church must reproduce disciples — priests, religious, lay people — committed to the Faith of the Church, its worship, its creeds, and its codes. During the Tridentine era the Church lost England, Scandinavia, Northern Germany, and almost lost Poland, but reformed herself in time with new religious orders — the Theatines, the Jesuits, Capuchins, etc., all, with a large number of great saints, often Jesuits, and the leadership of indomitable popes, especially Paul III, Paul IV, St. Pius V. During this Vatican II period the losses are less identifiable by nation, but they are no less severe because the religious bleeding is internal. Although the church in Holland has gained notoriety for its defiance of Rome, other churches in the affluent West are afflicted with various forms of religious malaise. New religious orders have not yet appeared in significant numbers, nor have the necessary saints, unless someone is willing to canonize Mother Teresa shortly after she dies. Yes, we do have John Paul II who manifests the qualities of the three Tridentine popes just mentioned. And, however he manages it, he with the world's bishops must exercise effective pastoral authoritl over priests and religious, and over the institutions which claim the Church's name and train the Church's leaders. The requirements of the New Code of Canon Law must be met. And someone, unless brought to virtue or obedience, may have to be excommunicated. Canon 751 says "Heresy is the obstinate post-baptismal denial of some truth which must be believed with divine and Catholic faith, or it is likewise an obstinate doubt concerning the same; apostasy is the total repudiation of the Christian faith; schism is the refusal of submission to the Roman Pontiff or of communion with the members of the Church subject to him".

We have heretics, aspostate and schismatics presently at work in critical Catholic educational and administrative institutions. This is not a new experience for the Church, of course, but dissidents must not be permitted in this day to play the Judas role at expense of the faith of those "little ones", even the faith of those seeking academic degrees. The rebels will protest loudly at any restraint on their activity. Contumacious dissenters will walk away or go underground. And the media will make life uncomfortable for anyone who dares defend the truths of Catholic Faith

or the Church which is their teacher. But if those truths and that Church are not worth the suffering, even the dying, they are not worthy of the living either.

All the headline making issues—married men priests, married priests, women acolytes or chancellors, curial reform, radical or conservative politics, etc. may well be resolved in ways proposed by present day activists and to the gain of the Church. But women priests, polygamy, violent revolution will be rejected in the 21st as contraception was in the 20th, as abortion was in the 1st century. The Church can develop and adopt new forms—but her essence and God's Word ever remain the same.

They are not wanting, those Catholic academia, some perhaps in Hierarchy, who say that the Church of Rome in the 21st century will evolve into an ecclesial body hardly different from the Church of England or from Churches in the liberal Protestant Tradition. They even believe the process has already gone too far to expect any other kind of "renewed" Church. Maybe so. But do not count old Mother Church out yet. Her record against "the gates of hell" is quite good. Hilaire Belloc once predicted the collapse of Western Christianity. He prophesied its recovery with an influx of missionaries from China. Belloc did not live long enough to guess the missionaries might be African.

In any event, why anyone would want the Church to take up lost religious causes at this last date is difficult to understand. A "people's church" left to its own devices fares badly with the people. Many of those modernised churches are empty save at concert time.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Here is something to think about. Those who would tailor God's word away from Church teaching toward what they think are the best interests of believers, and politicise the Church in the process, fail to explain the half empty churches which follow their intervention. They also choose to ignore the basis of the Church's credibility. Not in the vote of the crowds, nor in the consensus of elite, but on our faith in Jesus Christ and in the Church He established to teach God's Word in His name. The political orgy undertaken during the Council to sell the

pope on contraception should have taught something. Apparently, it did not. Other campaigns followed to overturn sections of the Apostle's Creed, The Christian Sexual Ethic, the Church's Social Gospel, and her doctrine on priesthood.

In the meantime the U.S. Catholic community shows 10,000,000 less worshippers at weekly Mass than we should have, and this in a Church whose ecclesial life has been linked closely with the Sunday Eucharist. Indeed, Catholic opinion-moulders minimise this leakage by calling our present averages higher than those for Europe. As if these comparable rates were ever close, as if this rationalisation can ever be justification for such a serious decline in the religious observance and the religious thinking (*sensus fidei*) of American Catholics. Further, deafening silence surrounds another fact; viz., that the U.S. Church would be truly seen as a shell of its former self if those presently 50 years of age and over were removed from Catholic pews and altars. This is the stark reality, the linkage of the central mystery of the Faith—the Mass—to Catholic lives has been broken. And with it the relationship of *magisterium* and the thinking of Catholics.

So we come back to the question : "Do we really believe?" In the Faith. Not in any faith, but in Jesus and the Catholic Church, in the Faith of the Second Vatican Council, and in the truth it teaches. On the opening day of the Council (October 11, 1962), John XXIII spelled out the orientation of great ecclesial event he initiated : "The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this : that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be more effectively guarded and taught". On November 24, 1985 John Paul II, opening the Extraordinary Synod said that the heart of the Second Vatican Council was the Church's "one, holy, Catholic, apostolic faith". Continued the pope :

"Faith is the basic principle, is the foundation, the essential criterion for the renewal desired by the Church. From this faith comes the moral norms, style of life, and the practical orientation for every circumstance".

If anyone wants a bottom line to contemporary Catholic polemics, here it is, and here it will remain when all the political jockeying over Catholic incidentals begin to bore the Catholics who continue to offer Sunday Mass.

In his general audience of June 22nd, 1988 Pope John Paul II explained how Jesus set the mission of the Apostles in line of continuity with His own mission at the Last Supper. The Lord then prayed: "As you sent me into the world, so I send them into the world."

Jesus, Founder of the Ministerial Structure of the Church

POPE JOHN PAUL II

IN the previous reflection we said that the whole mission of Jesus of Nazareth, His teaching, the miracles He wrought, up to the supreme miracle of the Resurrection (the sign of Jonah the prophet), were aimed at "gathering" people together.

This "assembly" of the new People of God constitutes the first outline of the Church, in which, by the will and institution of Christ, there should be brought into being and continue throughout the history of mankind the Kingdom of God initiated with the coming and with the messianic mission of Christ.

Jesus of Nazareth announced the Gospel to all those who followed Him to listen to Him, but at the same time He called some in a special way to follow Him in order to be prepared by Him for a future mission. Such, for example, was the calling of Philip (Jn. 1:43), of Simon (Lk. 5:10), and also of Levi, the publican. Even to the latter Christ addressed "follow me" (cf. Lk. 5:27-28).

Of particular importance for us is the fact that among His disciples Jesus chose the Twelve, a choice that had also the character of an "institution". In this regard Mark's *Gospel* used the term "appointed" (in Greek "*éποίησεν*"), a verb that the Greek text of the Septuagint used also for the work of creation. For this the original Hebrew text uses the word *bara*, which has not an exact equivalent in Greek. *Baru* expresses what only God Himself "does", by creating from nothing.

In any case the Greek expression “*ἐποίησεν*” is sufficiently eloquent in reference to the Twelve. It speaks of their institution as a decisive act of Christ who had produced a new reality. The functions or tasks which the Twelve receive are a consequence of what they have become by virtue of Christ's institution (instituted = made).

Significant also is the way in which Jesus chose the Twelve. “. . . Jesus went out into the hills to pray; and all night He continued in prayer to God. And when it was day, He called His disciples, and chose from them twelve, whom He named Apostles” (Lk. 6:12-13).

Then follow the names of those chosen : Simon, to whom Jesus gives the name Peter, James and John (Mark specifies that they were sons of Zebedee and that Jesus surnamed them *Boanerges*, which means “sons of thunder”), Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon who was called the Zealot, Judas the son of James, and Judas Iscariot, “who became the traitor” (Lk. 6:16). Between the lists of the Twelve found in the Synoptic Gospels and in the *Acts of the Apostles* there is agreement notwithstanding some slight differences.

Jesus Himself will speak one day of this choice of the Twelve, emphasizing what moved Him to do so : “You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you. . . .” (Jn. 15:16); and then He will add :

“If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you” (Jn. 15:19).

Jesus therefore appointed the Twelve “that they might be with Him”, and “to send them to preach and to have authority and to cast out demons” (Mk. 3:14-15). They were therefore chosen and “appointed” for a precise mission. They are people who are sent (i.e., “Apostles”). In *John’s* text we read further :

You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide” (Jn. 15:16).

This “fruit” in another place is designated by the image of “fishing”, when Jesus, after the miraculous catch of fish, says to Peter who was all excited by the miraculous event : “Do not be afraid; henceforth you will be catching men” (Lk. 5:10).

Jesus sets the mission of the Apostles in line of continuity with His own mission when, in His (priestly) prayer at the Last Supper, He says to the Father : "As you sent me into the world, so I sent them into the world" (Jn. 17:18).

In this context we can understand those other words of Jesus : "I confer a Kingdom on you, just as my Father has conferred one on me" (Lk. 22:29).

Jesus does not simply say to the Apostles : "The mystery of the Kingdom of God has been granted to you" (Mk. 4:11), as though it were granted merely by way of cognition, but He "hands over" to the Apostles the Kingdom which He Himself had initiated with His messianic mission on earth.

This Kingdom "conferred" on the Son by the Father is the fulfillment of the promises already given in the Old Covenant. The very number of "twelve" Apostles corresponds in Christ's words to the "twelve tribes of Israel". . . you who have followed me, in the new age, when the Son of Man is seated on His throne of glory, will yourselves sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Mt. 19:28; also Lk. 22:30). The Apostles, "the Twelve", as a beginning of the new Israel, are at the same time "placed" in the eschatological perspective of the call of the whole People of God.

After the Resurrection, Christ before definitely sending out the Apostles into the whole world, links to their service the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism (cf. Mt. 28:18-20), of the Eucharistic (cf. Mk. 14:22-24 and parallel passages), and of Penance and Reconciliation (cf. Jn. 20:22-23), instituted by Him as salvific signs of grace. The Apostles are therefore endowed with priestly and pastoral authority in the Church.

In the next reflection we shall speak of the sacramental structure of the Church. Here we wish to point out the institution of the ministerial structure, linked to the Apostles and later to the apostolic succession in the Church. In this regard we must also recall the words in which Jesus described and later instituted the particular ministry of Peter :

"And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of

Heaven, and whatever you bind on the earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Mt. 16:18-19).

They are all images which reflect and indicate the idea of the Church-Kingdom of God endowed with a ministerial structure, such as it was in the mind of Jesus.

The questions of ministry and at the same time of the hierarchical system of the Church will be examined in greater detail in the following series of ecclesiological reflections. Here it is fitting to point out merely a significant detail regarding the sad experience of Christ's Passion and death on the cross. Foreseeing Peter's denial, Jesus says to him:

"... But I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren" (Lk. 22:32).

Later, after the Resurrection, having obtained from Peter the threefold confession of love ("Lord, you know that I love you"), Jesus definitively confirms Peter's universal pastoral mission : "Feed my sheep. . ." (cf. Jn. 21:15-17).

We can therefore say that the respective Gospel passages clearly indicate that Jesus Christ hands over to the Apostles "the Kingdom" and "the mission" which He Himself had received from the Father. At the same time He institutes the fundamental structure of His Church in which this Kingdom of God, through the continuation of Christ's messianic mission, must be realized among all the nations of the earth as the messianic and eschatological fulfillment of God's eternal promises.

Jesus' last words to the Apostles before His return to the Father express in a definitive manner the reality and dimensions of that institution :

"All authority in Heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Mt. 28:18-20; also Lk. 24:47-48).

In this second of two articles, Father Crane inquires into the basic reason for the Church's failure to halt the neo-modernist thrust, which has made its way into her vitals in the wake of the Second Vatican Council.

CURRENT COMMENT

Drift away from the Faith

2. Wanted : The Courage to Act

THE EDITOR

The Faith Alive before the Council

WHAT held things firm in the pre-conciliar years—despite the defective Religious Instruction referred to in a previous article, and the Social Modernism that was its almost inevitable concomitant—was the faithfulness of the Catholic clergy, high and low, and Religious, male and female, particularly those of the teaching Orders and Congregations. It was the Religious Instruction, given in their schools, that gave to the practice of their religion by the Catholic laity the strength that comes from the firm and orthodox presentation of revealed truth. The result was what you might call a Catholic sense and spirit sufficiently strong to counter and, on the whole, neutralise the creeping advance of what was described last month in a previous article as Social Modernism. In this Island, at least, religious practice held. The same was largely true elsewhere. I came back to this country in 1948 after three months spent in the United States, which included a weekly post-graduate seminar at St. Louis University. I had the pleasure and privilege of speaking at other Catholic Colleges and Universities as well. I remarked on my return to the United Kingdom — and I was to repeat that remark in the course of another visit in the early sixties and before Vatican II — that if you wanted a picture of American Catholicism at its best, you would find it on the campus of any Catholic College or University you chose to mention. I meant what I said. The thing was an inspiration. The whole university atmosphere breathed the Faith. Neither was the American an isolated situation in this regard. Its

equivalent could be found in different form in any of a fair number of varied organizations throughout the countries of the Western World — from Pax Romana, as it then was in Europe, to the Boerenbond in Belgium and, for example, the Jeunesse Oeuvrière Catholique in France; in the United Kingdom, very specially, the many parish organizations and congregations I was privileged to address, in the course of fifteen years of work with the Catholic Social Guild, particularly in the North of England, in Scotland's Strathclyde and Ayrshire, to say nothing of the Republic of Ireland, which I remember with particular affection and admiration. In all one found the Faith, vibrant and alive in practice, despite the deficiencies that attended its teaching too often in classroom and pulpit. The fabric of this pre-conciliar Catholicism was held together, under God, by strong Supreme and Diocesan Authority within the Church, supported by a unity of doctrine and a habit of obedience on the part of Clergy, Religious and Faithful, responsive always to Authority's injunctions. The presumption was that this situation would continue. In fact, it broke in the wake of the Council. One asks why.

The Faith Breaks after the Council

It broke because the presumption of Pope John XXIII, when he summoned the Council, was that Catholics — clergy and laity alike — were ready for the *aggiornamento* he hoped for from Vatican II. The time had come, the old Pope thought, for the Church to throw open her windows to the world, so that the Catholic ethos and, with it, the Faith, would penetrate an increasingly secularized environment. Tragically, this was not so. The windows were thrown open. What happened, in fact, was the reverse of what Pope John expected. What went out of the window was a white flag of surrender from many churchmen, symbolic of a desire, it seemed, to assimilate the truth of the Church to the shifting standards of a secularist world; no longer desirous of giving men its truth whole and entire; anxious as it appeared, to suit the Catholic Church's doctrinal and moral teaching to the passing moods and inclinations of that ephemeral creature, who has always been with us and whom the eager beavers of the post-conciliar clerical world were quick to christen "modern

man". (We have had one, of course, in every age). What came in through the window after the white flag had been thrust out — and with hurricane force to boot — was the gale of a secular and increasingly permissive world. This tore its way through the Church and has continued to ravage it ever since.

No Criticism of the Council Here

Let me make it clear at once that, in writing as I have just done, I am not criticising the Council as such. My strictures are reserved for those who, purporting to act in what they called "the spirit of Vatican II", made use of their own interpretation of the Council's message to foist on clergy and Faithful alike their own neo-modernistic doctrines and desires, which ran counter to the whole trend of the Council's teaching. Those who acted in this fashion we will lump together in this article under the general title of the Neo-Modernist Establishment. By this we mean those whose goal was and remains a New Church, man-centered rather than centered on God as the Old was so centered, despite its deficiencies; intent, in consequence, on suiting doctrine to the prevailing popular mood, accommodating itself to man's inclinations rather than holding out to him God's truth; taking its cue from the bottom up rather than from the top down, moving closer and closer, as it does so, to the secular humanitarian ecumenism that typifies the present stance of the World Council of Churches. For such as these the Council — however sound its basic teaching — offered boundless opportunities. These were there for those prepared to read between the lines of the conciliar documents, trading on the ambiguities contained in too many of them, studying the nuances (the emphasis or lack of it with which they were sprinkled) as representing in their eyes so many jumping-off points for post-conciliar action. There can be no doubt whatsoever about this. Michael Davies writes in the fifth printing of his splendidly perceptive volume on the Council¹: "Douglas Woodruff, one of England's outstanding Catholic scholars, was editor of *The Tablet* during Vatican II. In one of his reports on the Council, he remarks: 'For in a sense this Council has been the Council of the *Periti*, silent in the *aula*, but so effective in the commissions and at bishops' ears'".

The Domination of the Periti

In other words, according to the late Douglas Woodruff, and as Michael Davies goes on to make abundantly clear in the second volume of his trilogy on "The Liturgical Revolution", it would not be untrue to say that the *Periti*—skilled theologians who advised the bishops—dominated the Council. They captured the Council's corridors of power and within those corridors they did their work. The story is extremely well told by Davies and I have no intention of repeating it here. Those who study it closely will see that the majority of the *Periti*, who were largely of neo-modernist bent and intent, were able, from the dominating position they won for themselves at the Council, to win subsequently for themselves and their adherents, at all levels in the post-conciliar Church, positions of power from which they could influence the content of its teaching and evangelising message away from God's truth and in the direction demanded by their vision of a new, man-centered Church which was and remains their ideal. It was during the years in the immediate wake of the Council that the "spirit of the Council" came into its own as a catch-phrase that permitted any number of beliefs and practices that run counter to the teaching of the Council itself, to be thrust on the Faithful in its name. To date, the efforts of the progressive, neo-modernist Establishment have been extremely successful. Its adherents have accomplished largely what they set out to do. They remain virtually in occupation of the Catholic Church at diocesan level. Yet, as they see it, there remains still more to be done. They will be satisfied only with total victory.

Failure to Halt the neo-Modernist Drive

Neo-modernist progress within the Church has indeed been astonishing. We have to ask now whether it can be halted. We can answer this question best, I believe, by inquiring into the failure of the Church to halt the neo-modernist thrust during the twenty odd years that have passed since the closure of Vatican II. To begin with, I can understand how, during the Council itself and its immediate wake, the dominating neo-modernist thrust should have taken the Bishops by surprise. For a good many of the Council Fathers the experience was a good

deal more than surprising. It was traumatic. They hardly knew where they stood after the verbal mugging they received at the hands of the neo-Modernist Establishment during the Council years. The Council, indeed, had declared them successors of the Apostles, yet, here they were, at the Council itself and in its aftermath, bowled over and out by the torrent of words thrown at them—so many of those words in the current, barely understandable contemporary theological newspeak—in the formal sessions of the Council and, more directly and powerfully, by the *Periti* themselves in the daily informal sessions within what I have called the conciliar corridors of power. I can understand that, under such circumstances, the inclination of many bishops at the Council and in its aftermath (and still to-day), not knowing really where they stood, would be to let the already entrenched Progressive neo-Modernist Establishment take what amounted in practice to effective control in their own dioceses, whilst they, the bishops sat back and tried to work out where they were and, in a good many cases, what they were. A good many of them are still at this task; others have given it up, resigning themselves to what they think of (wrongly I most firmly believe) as the inevitability of progressive change.

Why Has the neo-Modernist Thrust not been Halted

At this point, I suggest, it would be good to try and discover where we ourselves stand in this somewhat depressing picture. That can be done shortly and very simply. In other words, why, twenty-three years after the closure of Vatican II, is Progressive neo-Modernism in as strong a position as ever within the Church, which it is doing its best to destroy? The fact that it will never succeed in destroying the Catholic Church is, in this context, somewhat beside the point. The question I keep asking myself is why, after all this time, the Progressive neo-Modernist Establishment is still allowed, so far as I can see, to do its best to try. Why was not the threat of that Establishment stopped dead in its track long ago? Instead, seemingly allowed to continue; in the process fragmenting the faith of thousands of Catholics; leaving them at the end of the day bereft of their identity as Catholics, which was once their pride; leaving them up-

ended, then, in near despair, drifting in tears from the Faith for which their Fathers died. Again, I ask myself, Why so ? Granted the bewilderment consequent on the trauma produced by the initial neo-modernist onslaught, granted the sense of helplessness induced by that bewilderment, I have asked myself again and again, why, once the initial bewilderment had passed, was the neo-modernist thrust allowed to continue. Why, long since, has that same thrust not been confronted and overcome ?

Hierarchy Has Failed to Check the Thrust

So far as I can see, the Catholic Church being by nature an hierarchical society, there can only be one answer to this question. I give it with respect and without prejudice, on a basis of objective fact. To say that the Catholic Church has failed to check neo-Modernism, which is indisputably true, must mean that the governing Hierarchy of the Church has failed to check it. Given the hierarchical structure of that divinely founded society, which is the Catholic Church, you cannot say anything else. It represents no more and no less than an objective statement of fact. As such, neutral; presented without malice aforethought; otherwise it would not be objective. It is important to note this. If I say, "There is a lot of rain falling on that village", it would be quite wrong to assume and to say that I am making that remark because I dislike and wish harm to its inhabitants. Similarly if, with respect, I assign to episcopal failure the continuing spread of Progressive neo-Modernism within the Church, it would be quite unjust to say that I am "disobedient" or prejudiced against the Episcopate here or elsewhere. I am not so prejudiced. What I am after is the overall reason for the continuing spread of Progressive neo-Modernism within the Church. On a basis of fact, I assign it primarily to episcopal failure. The *fact* of this failure is one thing. The *reasons* for it constitute quite another. They may be good or they may be bad. Either way appropriate action must be taken, in the case of an hierarchical society like the Church, by Supreme Episcopal Authority; which can only be that of the Pope. If it is not taken, the drift into Progressive neo-Modernism will continue and the disintegration of the

Church will proceed unchecked, to the disillusionment and despair of the Faithful. I would suggest that this represents the situation as it is, at this moment, within the Catholic Church.

Reasons for the Failure

Can the reasons for the failure of the Episcopate throughout the Church to confront Progressive neo-Modernism and turn it back be given? As in other cases, provided they are solidly grounded and presented, not with servility on the one hand or rudeness on the other, but with the respect due to high office in the Church as elsewhere, there is no reason why they should not be given; every reason, I would suggest, why they should. The alternative is that the Bishop should continue to surround himself with "yes-men" or tolerate his present surround of those who are clearly of neo-modernist bent and, indeed, intent. Under such circumstances, he remains encased within a layered bureaucracy, inaccessible to those who have a genuine criticism or complaint to put before him, deceiving himself with the thought that he is truly governing his diocese when others, in fact, are making diocesan policy for him, shaping it and giving it practical effect in a way that suits their neo-modernist and progressive intentions, but not necessarily those of the Bishop himself. Under such circumstances, I would say, episcopal government becomes something of a sham and the local, diocesan Church disintegrates in the hands of the one whose duty, by reason of his episcopal office, is, under God, to hold it together in the Faith. The firmness and the courage to undertake this task is what God demands of every diocesan bishop. Where this is lacking for whatever reason — good or bad — removal is called for. It cannot be any other way, where an hierarchical society is concerned. Without a shepherd or with one who fails in his duty, the flock will be destroyed. This is a situation that should not be allowed to continue.

It is a pity that in many countries, particularly of Western Europe and North America, so many Bishops should appear as welcoming neither genuine criticism nor, even, discussion, especially where Traditionalists within the Catholic Church are concerned. These know now that they have little or no redress, especially in matters very

close to their hearts. I am thinking in particular of the Mass, of age-old devotions, so loved by so many, and of the religious instruction of their children at school. I will not go into further detail. There is neither space nor time left for this. Neither is it necessary to give it. Readers will know full well what I mean.

Wanted: A Touch of Glasnost

My plea at the end of this article, made with all the strength I can muster, is for open and honest talk at all levels within the Catholic Church; within this context, for the accessibility of Bishops to all and sundry in their dioceses, clergy and laity alike. Given this accessibility, which presumes episcopal receptivity and concern with regard to legitimate criticism and complaints, the present doleful situation that besets so many dioceses throughout the Church would very soon be bettered, and the Episcopate would become credible again in the eyes of so many Catholics. Confidence would return, both to Bishops and their flocks; and, with confidence, there would come what is sadly lacking now, *the courage to act*. Once this point is reached, the neo-Modernists would begin running for cover and their creed would go with them. Meanwhile, rather than despair we should pray very hard and work very hard for this kind of culmination. Let us take a leaf out of Gorbachev's book. A touch of *Glasnost* at all levels within the Catholic Church would bring great benefits to her people in this, their hour of greatest need.

DREAM-TICKET FOR PROGRESSIVES

"A new consensus could only come about if this traditional power could be deposed and the Church reconstructed on conciliar, democratic lines accountable to the people. Then the theological consensus of the academy could serve as a guide for the pastoral teaching of the Church."

"This is really what Kung is calling for: that the academy replace the Hierarchy as the teaching Magisterium of the Church".

—*Rosemary Ruether, feminist theologian, 1980*

THE GOD-MADE-MAN'S NATIVITY

The constant Theme of Prophets from of old,
In varied versions told :

The Coming of the Holy One of God,
By Whom all evils would be overthrown.
A Conqueror, men hoped; 'mid splendour known;
In Birth high-placed; soon at His kingly nod
He'd vanquish all His nation's enemies
by open victories.

God's Angel to a Virgin came,
Foretold She'd bear His Son of Fame —
In Manhood He mankind would save.
Yet later, when He came on Earth —
Although acclaimed by Heaven's mirth,
Homeless was His Birth.
Found lying in an ox's stall,
Was to some simple shepherds shown,
In a stable-cave.

The Conqueror by mighty Love! So small
He made Himself, He longed be loved by all—
To curl His Baby Fingers round our hearts,
Heal them from their sinful smarts,
And make them His Dear Own.

Mary Ada George

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH

She stands upon Her only Rock,
Christ's lawful, lovely Bride.
In vain false sects dash round about —
Fevered with pestilential draught
From heresies' sterile wine.
The labels change; old stinks remain;
The wise ones pour it down Rome's drain,
And know their souls' refreshment-gain
Comes from the One True Vine.
Though some Her sons Her doctrines flout,
Slander and belie Her;
Their loyalty deny Her,
She has from Christ the power to teach
The only *sure* way men can reach
The heavens for which they pine.
She, mothering Her faithful flock
Ascending Faith's firm terraces,
Without a falter or a doubt
Protects from falsehood's menaces :
Holds high Truth's Lamp no man puts out,
Nor sinful errors hide.
For Christ, Her Founder, promised He'll abide
Till Time's end, ever, only, by Her side.

Mary Ada George

Given the neo-modernist infiltration of the Catholic Church today, with its assault, amongst other things, on the Divinity of Christ, this brief but telling account of the struggle of the great Athanasius against the Arians of his day, who denied Christ's divinity, has great relevance for all Catholics at the present time. Acknowledgements and thanks to "Living Tradition" in Rome.

Athanasius *Contra Mundum*: A Tale for our Times

MONICA KING

ST. Athanasius was one of the greatest Christian bishops of all time. He was born in Alexandria (c. 296) of wealthy Egyptian parents who were able to send their 'little' son (for he was little in stature) to the famous Catechetical School at Alexandria, where the saintly Clement of Alexandria had taught in the late second or early third century. Origen, the great teacher, Scripture exegete, and philosopher, took over from Clement, who was presumed to have been martyred, as head of the school at the early age of eighteen. It was possible therefore for Athanasius to have a broad Greek education combined with a Christian one, and Athanasius soon became well-versed in the Scriptures. Not only his studies, however, but the fact that he grew up during the last and possibly the worst of all the Christian persecutions, under Diocletian, must have had a profound effect on him. Although his mother did not hide his clothes, as we are told of Origen, in order that he should escape martyrdom, nevertheless he was in danger throughout his childhood and refers to it in his *De Incarnatione*. This work was written when he was a young man and before Arius had even been thought of. It was the second of a two-part treatise, the first part of which was called *Contra Gentes*, or *Against the Heathen*. He wrote it as his first major work for a young man called Macarius, who was a recent convert to Christianity. In it we sense

a virtual break with his Greek Platonic background. The soul could no longer, as Plato propounded, become divine merely by contemplation of God. It had fallen from its original state of grace and was a very frail entity in need of a saviour. The crux of Athanasius' teaching is that the soul is *created out of nothing* (*creata ex nihilo*) and not out of any pre-existent and uncreated matter, because to accept this teaching of Plato would be to deny that God Himself is the cause of matter and therefore to impute limitation to God, just as it is a limitation on the part of a carpenter if he can make nothing unless he has the wood with which to make it. St. Athanasius saw no diminution of God, only the corruption of man who needed a saviour in order "that He might turn again to incorruption men who had turned back to corruption, and make them alive through death by the appropriation of his body and by the grace of His resurrection. Thus He would make death to disappear from them as utterly as straw from fire" (*De Incarnatione*, Chap. II).

Some time shortly after Athanasius had written his first work, the Alexandrian presbyter and popular rector of a suburban parish, Arius, began to teach that Christ was *inferior* to the Father, and that "Son of God" was a mere courtesy title. Arius maintained that in actual fact Christ owed his existence to the Father, and that therefore to suggest that he is equal to the Father or "consubstantial" with the Father was in some way to detract from the Godhead. The doctrine of Arius naturally caused a furore in the Church of those days, and the Emperor Constantine himself intervened by calling a council which was the first oecumenical council of the Church at Nicaea in the year 325 A.D. There it was decided to adopt the term *homoousion*, or 'of the same substance or being with the Father', to describe the unity which exists between the Father and the Son. This formula was accepted by the majority of bishops, but, as in most councils of the Church, there are always those who leave the council-chambers with feelings of dissatisfaction and even resentment. In this case it was Eusebius of Nicomedia, the leader of the Arian group at the Council, who was the chief trouble-maker. He immediately demanded the recall of Arius from banishment and

persuaded Constantine to oppose the Bishop of Alexandria, who was by this time Athanasius himself. Athanasius refused to comply and was, therefore, deposed from office by Constantine and sent into exile. When Constantine died two years later, Athanasius was restored to his see. But Eusebius, ever busy making trouble behind the scenes, prevailed upon Constantius, the Emperor of the East, and Athanasius was replaced by another pseudo-bishop of Arian persuasion. So, for a second time, Athanasius was forced into exile. In 346 he was again restored, only to be condemned shortly afterwards by a council at Milan. On this occasion Athanasius spent seven years in hiding with the monks in the desert. They were not by any means fruitless years, for Athanasius took a great interest in monasticism. With the Coptic monks he found peace, inspiration, and time to write. He wrote a life of the founder of the Desert Fathers, St. Antony, who lived to the ripe old age of 105. It was also in the desert that Athanasius tackled the Arians and wrote his famous *Contra Arianos*. The monks, though some of them were said to have been illiterate, nevertheless helped him greatly in distributing his writings to the people.

After his fifth period of exile, Athanasius was at last brought back by popular acclaim throughout Egypt to his beloved Alexandria, where he spent the last seven years of his life shepherding the Egyptian Church. He died about the year 373, and his feast-day is kept on May second.

The work of Athanasius did not end there; it was carried on by the great Cappadocian Fathers, St. Basil and the two Gregorios. But it was Athanasius who laid the foundation, and they merely tidied up the terminology. The *homoousion* doctrine was finally ratified at the Council of Constantinople in 381. The Nicene faith which St. Athanasius had so vigorously defended is contained in the Nicene Creed, not actually compiled by him. In it is affirmed the belief that, if Christ is God, then He must be God in the same sense as God the Father, that is, He must be "of one and the same substance or being with the Father". As the Cappadocian Fathers affirmed, the doctrine of one substance in the Trinity underlined the essential "stuff" of the Godhead, whilst at the same time teaching that there were three distinct Persons, or *hypostases*, within the Trinity.

The unity and trinity of God were preserved for all time, and Arius' attempts to demote Christ to being less than God had failed. Difficult times lay ahead for the Church in the next few centuries, but if this truth had not been maintained in the face of Arius, it is difficult to see how Christianity would have survived.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus, his contemporary, writing a few years after the death of Athanasius tells us how he was "raised up for the Church's need". This was how he described the way in which Athanasius fulfilled the office of bishop:

He was sublime in action, lowly in mind; inaccessible in virtue, most accessible in intercourse; gentle, free from anger, sympathetic, sweet in words, sweeter in disposition; angelic in appearance, more angelic in mind; calm in rebuke, persuasive in praise, without spoiling the good effect of either by excess, but rebuking with the tenderness of a father. . . .

Athanasius contra mundum is a phrase that no doubt many students of Church history have often heard. It is certainly no less exaggerated than Saint Jerome's remark, "that all the world suddenly woke up to find itself Arian". Perhaps people were more concerned about the doctrines of the Church in those days, but, however suddenly it appeared, it was centuries before Arianism disappeared. No doubt the errors which have sprung up since Vatican II, although not contained in the Council documents, will take as long, if not longer, to die out.

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

EVERY MONDAY

TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.

Preceded by

ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.

Written against a United States background, this excellent and very clear exposition of Fundamentalism is of universal application, in view of the world-wide thrust of this creedless and multi-named "religious" movement.

Points at Issue

The Fundamentalists

FATHER THOMAS O'MAHONY

BIBLICAL FUNDAMENTALISTS

WITHIN recent years the Catholic bishops of the United States and Latin America have publicly expressed concern over the inroads made by Fundamentalist groups into the ranks of Catholic laity. That the threat is serious has not been denied, but so far nothing substantive has been done to remedy the situation and get at the root of the problem.

The only official statement made on behalf of the *National Conference of Catholic Bishops* was issued on September 30, 1987, by an Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Archbishop John Whealon of Hartford, Conn. (see *Origins*, Vol., No. 21). Since then a few articles have appeared in Catholic magazines: the September 1987 issue of the liberal Jesuit monthly *America*; the February 1988 issue of *Crisis* (a journal of Lay Catholic opinion); and the *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*, February 1988.

As few Catholics know what Fundamentalism really is and how it differs from the main-line Protestant Churches (Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, etc.) it would be well to give a brief explanation here.

First of all, it should be noted that the Fundamentalists are not cultists. According to Fr. James Lebar, an authority on cults, such groups have five characteristics: (a) a charismatic leader who focuses attention on himself instead of God; (b) the use of deception in recruiting; (c) promotion of an adversarial attitude toward the outside

world; (d) the use of fear and guilt to keep a member within the group; (e) using members to raise money or centralizing control of money, "Cultism is religious perversion and organized heresy", writes Manly Clark, a counter-cult evangelist.

Fundamentalists, therefore, are Protestants and anti-Catholic. In fact, they are "constitutionally and incurably anti-Catholic", according to Dr. Roy Barkley, a former Fundamentalist who converted to Catholicism (*H & P Review*, February 1988).

They "regard the scriptures with deep reverence. To them scripture is inspired of God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, correction and training in holiness so that the man of God may be fully competent and equipped for every good work (II Tim. 4:15-17). That is, no matter what intellectual inquiry goes into exegesis, the scriptures are the inspired word of God and not a mere anthropological artifact. They transcend their human origins and offer timeless normative insight into human actions and the judgments of God". (Barkley)

"Biblical Fundamentalists", according to the NCCB sub-committee, "are those who present the Bible, God's inspired word, as the necessary source for teaching about Christ and Christian living . . . a further characteristic of biblical fundamentalism is that it tends to interpret the Bible . . . as *literally* true in a way quite different from the Catholic Church's teaching on the inerrancy of the Bible . . . The Bible is presented without regard to its historical context and development".

"We observe in biblical fundamentalism", continues the sub-committee, "an effort to find in the Bible all the direct answers—simplistic answers to complex issues—in a confident authority. The appeal of such an approach is understandable . . . people of all ages yearn for answers. They look for sure, definite rules for living and they are given answers—simplistic answers to complex issues—in a confident and enthusiastic way in fundamentalist Bible groups".

"The basic characteristic of Biblical Fundamentalism" adds the sub-committee, "is that it eliminates from Christianity the Church as the Lord Jesus found it . . . there is

no mention of the historic authoritative Church in continuity with Peter and the other Apostles".

Fundamentalists, therefore, reject the teaching of the early Church Councils and the Creeds.

It is obvious that the main-line Protestant Churches have much in common with the Fundamentalists (like Swaggart, Falwell, et alii) in that they hold the Bible to be the sole rule of faith and each one is assisted by the Holy Spirit in interpreting the scriptures. But the main-line churches today "have embraced the social gospel as their creed. Some never mention scripture at all; many church services have come more to resemble Rotary Club meetings" (Hart in *Crisis*).

It is because the main-line churches have embraced "human fashion and conventional opinion" (Hart) as their creed that they are losing members in droves, while the Fundamentalists are increasing in numbers.

WHY CATHOLICS JOIN THE FUNDAMENTALISTS?

According to the NCCB sub-committee, which was quoted above, Biblical Fundamentalists "try to find in the Bible all the direct answers for living—though the Bible nowhere claims such authority. The *appeal* of such an approach is understandable . . . people of all ages yearn for answers . . . The appeal is evident for the Catholic young adult or teenager whose family background may be troubled; who is struggling with life, morality and religion; whose Catholic education may have been seriously inadequate in the fundamentals of doctrine . . . For such a person, the appeal of finding *the answer* in a devout, studious and prayerful warm, Bible-quoting class is easy to understand". Finally, the statement adds: "The neglect of parents in Catechetics and the weakness of our adult education efforts are now producing a grim harvest. We need to educate—to re-educate—our people knowingly in the Bible so as to counteract the simplicities of Biblical Fundamentalism".

Here is the explanation given by Dr. Roy Barkley, the former Fundamentalist: "Catholics are becoming disaffected in record numbers, in places where the Church is traditionally strongest, because they look to the Church to

satisfy their religious needs and are disappointed. Fundamentalism offers them clear moral teaching and a reasonable certitude of faith, such a certitude, as human beings crave in their innermost hearts. The calamity of the Church in our time is that for many we have stopped fulfilling this need.

"What happens to those who seek it in the Church? They see nationally televised attacks on the Catholic faith by Catholic priests. They find priests and theologians at Catholic Universities attacking the Holy Father and not only rejecting the moral teachings of the Church but concocting a "right to dissent" in Tradition itself. An account of the 'loss in Catholic identity' would be an account of religious orders becoming political action committees, of liturgical gimcrackery, or heretical catechisms, of the ubiquitous public rejection of Church teaching that festered upon the promulgation of *Humanae Vitae*. Confused Catholics see the branches attacking the vine, and from most bishops and priests they hear only the silence that implies assent. This is the Catholic side of the matter: the wolves in shepherd's clothing, in a world sickened by self-worship and subjectivism, are ravaging the flock. On the Fundamentalist side, you won't find Jimmy Swaggart and Jerry Falwell attacking the authority of *their* religion".

Benjamin Hart (*Crisis*, February 1988) gives this explanation: ". . . the root problem with the Catholic Church in America is not just inane political statements emanating from its leaders. These are only symptoms. The real disease is an overemphasis on man to solve man's problems, the result of which is an increasingly secular message. When the gospel becomes the 'social gospel', it isn't long before it becomes 'liberation theology' and Jesus Christ is presented as a political revolutionary. But people don't go to church to hear a political diatribe."

"Tragically, the Catholic Church has chosen to follow the example of the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists, to downplay the unadulterated gospel message, and to hedge on the issue of biblical inerrancy in order to sound more sophisticated and up-to-date".

THE SITUATION IN LATIN AMERICA

That the Fundamentalists are making large numbers of converts among Hispanics is a recognized fact. Here are just three news-items: (1) On March 12m 1986, the seventeen Catholic Bishops of Alta and Baja, California, met in Los Angeles to discuss the notable conversions of Hispanics to Fundamentalism. According to reports, these groups offer simple teachings with clear-cut answers and distribute Bibles as the only source of revelation (2) Some bishops in Latin America have conducted a study of Fundamentalist Churches, which were and are making inroads into their Catholic communities. It was discovered that Catholics were of the opinion that the bishops and priests were too concerned with socio-political issues and were neglecting the spiritual needs of their people. The Fundamentalists fulfilled that need; (3) The Brazilian bishops have the same problem. In their country the Pentecostal Churches (Fundamentalists) are growing fast. According to Manoel DeMello, founder of Brazil for Christ, a Pentecostal Church: "The Catholic Church is ahead of the Evangelical Churches on the socio-political level, but it does not fulfil the spiritual needs of the Brazilians. Today the priest is not seen anymore as a man of God, but as someone who shows how to stand up to the boss".

It should be noted here that Fundamentalists use various names for their churches—New Testament Churches, Holiness Churches, Pentecostal Churches, Charismatic Churches, and so on. The TV evangelists are also fundamentalists.

In his article in the *H & P Review*, February 1988, Dr. Barkley criticized *America Magazine* because the editorial in the September 27, 1987 issue proposed as a solution to the Fundamentalist threat in Latin America "liberation theology, even going so far as to pretend that the Holy Father completely endorses it, while in Latin America theology" even going so far as to pretend that the Holy talist mill as fast as it can grind: for Fundamentalists find it easy to persuade Latin-American Catholics tha they do not want the socialist revolutionary Jesus. What they do want is a reasonable certitude about the truths of the Faith.

ANSWERS TO FUNDAMENTALIST QUESTIONS : 1

Nowadays Catholics, especially the young, are exposed to fundamentalist TV programs, and booklets, which criticize Catholic doctrines as not being sanctioned by the Bible. Fundamentalists, be it noted, interpret the Bible literally for the most part and claim that it is the sole rule (source) of faith.

Consequently, it is necessary for Catholics to be acquainted with the truths of our faith, so as "to be always ready with a reason for the hope that is in you" (1 Peter 3: 15).

We will begin by discussing various questions concerning the Bible as almost all the differences between Catholics and non-Catholics center on this book.

1. The word "Bible" comes from a Greek word "Biblia" which means "Books" or "the great books". The Catholic Bible contains 72 books, of which 45 belong to the Old Testament and 27 to the new Testament. The first book was written at least 1500 years before the birth of Christ and the last book dates from about 100 after His birth. The various books were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic or Greek. Later, after the apostolic age, the Bible was translated into Latin, and, long before Martin Luther arrived on the scene, the Catholic Bible was translated into Italian, Spanish, French, German and English.

When printing was invented, the first book off the presses was the Catholic Bible. This occurred in 1456 when a Catholic named Gutenberg printed it at Mainz, Germany, at the request of his bishop. At least eighteen editions were printed in Germany before Luther. Yet, we find Luther saying: "The Bible lay under the bench, forgotten in the dust." In 1946 some of his followers carried this unhistorical accusation even further when they accused the Catholic Church of being hostile to the Bible and of withholding it from the laity lest they take their religion from the Bible and not from the living Church.

However, highly competent and well-known Protestant historians have established the falsity of these statements. For instance, the German historian, Michael, who spent a lifetime of research on this subject, stated that the "Bible was the most widely circulated book in the Middle Ages" and this is re-echoed by the librarian of the Protestant

Archbishop of Canterbury, England: "There are a great deal of popular misapprehensions about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the Catholic clergy, whereas the fact is that the sermons of the medieval preachers are more full of scriptural quotations and illustrations than any sermons in our day. . . ."

2. It must be insisted, as the acts of the apostles and historical research establish, that Christ founded a visible church, that it was a "going concern" at the time of His Ascension, and that it was in existence before a single book of the New Testament was written. Christ never wrote a line of it and never ordered its books to be written.

Therefore, it was members of the Catholic Church in the First Century who wrote it "and the Magisterium" (Pope and bishops in communion with him) had it copied and translated.

The Catholic Church, therefore, is the Mother of the Bible, and she alone has the right and duty to interpret this book which belongs to her.

3. When Luther rebelled against the Church in the Sixteenth Century, the only Bible in existence was the Catholic one, and of this Bible he said: "You are to deal with the scriptures as to bear in mind that God Himself is saying this". This is perfectly correct. But on what authority did Luther make this statement?

We Catholics hold that the Bible is the inspired word of God because the Magisterium of the Church said so. But, since Luther and all non-Catholics reject the Magisterium, where is their proof of the divine inspiration and its freedom from error? The New Testament, for example, makes no such statement, it had no general editor (except God) and is a mere collection of texts written at different times by different men. In Paul's second letter to Timothy (3:15) where it is stated that "all scripture is inspired of God", it is historically proven that the Apostle was referring to the Old Testament.

The inspiration and innerrancy of the Bible are very important to Protestantism. It stands or falls with the solution of their questions.

As stated above, these questions pose no problems for Catholics as we believe that the Magisterium is infallible in teaching Christ's doctrines. But Protestants have no court of higher appeal and the Bible itself is of no help to them in this matter. They got the Bible from the Catholic Church, which wrote it and guaranteed its authenticity. So here we have a contradiction. They reject the divine constitution of the Catholic Church and yet accept her word that her book, the Bible, is divinely inspired and innerant.

Later on another explanation was given by the Reformers for accepting the Bible. The Holy Spirit, they said, speaking in the heart of every godly man, identifies the books which He inspired. But this is a purely subjective authority and not acceptable. Remember that Mohammed regarded the Koran as inspired. Are we to accept this also?

4. Historians have established that beside the 73 books in the Catholic Bible, there were in existence some other ancient books, which claimed to be the works of certain Apostles, as, for example, the *Gospel of St. Thomas*. Other books, which many accepted as inspired and were quite orthodox, were *Didache* (teaching of the twelve apostles) and the *Shephard of Herman*. Other books claimed to give details on the life of the Holy Family and were regarded by many as inspired.

To further confuse the issue some of the genuine books of the New Testament fell into disrepute because heretics used them too freely, and St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was rejected by many as they regarded the style as not typically Pauline.

In such a situation, who was to decide which books were or were not inspired? For a period of four centuries the early Fathers of the Church carefully studied all these books, and, finally, at the General Councils of Hippo (393 A.D.) and Carthage (397 A.D.) settled the question. Only the 73 books now in the Catholic Bible were declared to be inspired. Both Lightfoot and Harnack (no friends of the Catholic Church) said: "That the Catholic Church is responsible for the canon of Holy Scripture is certainly true.

It is quite obvious, then, that we owe it to the Catholic Church that we have the Bible".

ANSWERS TO FUNDAMENTALISTS QUESTIONS : 2

Having rejected the Magisterium of the Church (Pope and Bishops in Communion with him), Luther introduced one of the cardinal tenets of Protestantism, namely, private interpretation of the Bible, i.e. to say, each one has the right to interpret the Bible for himself, and, in doing so, is guaranteed the protection of the Holy Spirit.

This is a mere subjective rule, and the religious chaos, existing in modern-day Protestant churches, make it quite evident to common-sense that it won't work. There are today close to 600 Protestant churches, most of them breakaways from the main-line churches; all use the same Bible but are giving different interpretations to it. Besides, members of any of these churches are not obliged to accept the interpretation of the minister.

Now, since most admit that Christ is a divine person, who knew the future, it is necessary to conclude that He would have foreseen the chaotic state in churches following Luther's rule, and would not have left us in such a mess. Surely, after spending three years preaching and teaching, He would have made sure that the people of 1988 would be able to know for certain what He actually wants us to believe and do to be saved.

He had several options—either remain on earth till the end of the world, so that we could consult Him; establish a "hot-line" to heaven so that we could contact Him; or establish a supreme authority in every generation divinely protected by Him, so that we would have the means of acquiring for certain His full teaching and its interpretation.

The Fathers of this country would not permit the citizens to interpret the Constitution for themselves because they rightly foresaw utter chaos. Consequently, they set up a Supreme Court of nine persons, which would last till the end of time, and this Court alone had the right to interpret the Constitution.

That is precisely what Christ did. His Supreme Court is the Magisterium of the Church and His Constitution is the teaching He gave to His original Magisterium—Peter (1st Pope) and the Apostles (Bishops). But He could do what the fathers of this country could not do, namely, protect His Magisterium by the divine gift of infallibility. Speaking

to His Magisterium He said : "He who hears you, hears Me and he, who rejects you, rejects Me" (Luke 10: 16). How could He make such a promise unless He intended to protect them from error in teaching doctrine and morals? Besides, He told them that they were to teach people "*all* that I have commanded you" (Matt. 28: 20) and promised "Behold, I am with you all days till the end of the world" (Matt. 28: 20).

Another promise of infallibility was given to Peter when he was made the first Vicar of Christ on earth : "And I say to you : you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16: 18). "Gates of hell" in this text means the "powers of hell", Satan and the fallen angels. As Christ said, Satan is the "father of lies" and the only way he could destroy the teaching church would be to cause it to fall into error. From such a catastrophe Christ promised Peter that He would protect it.

In rebuttal, Protestants bring forward two texts, which, they contend, show that Christ commanded us to "search the Scriptures" and not just listen to a Magisterium.

The first text is from John 5: 39 : "Search the scriptures for you think in them you have eternal life; they also testify on my behalf". According to biblical commentators, Our Lord was not telling the Jews to interpret the Bible privately. He was merely commenting on the fact that they read the scriptures (the O.T.) which, they held, contain the words of life and point to the Messiah, yet they read into it what suited their own ideas.

The second text is from Acts 17: 10 where Luke appears to praise the Bereans for reading the Bible to find out what Jesus taught : "Each day they studied the scriptures (O.T.) to see whether these things were so". Here the Bereans are said to have checked the O.T. to see if Paul had correctly cited them and given the proper interpretation.

Both texts are worthless as a basis for private interpretation of the Bible.

On the other hand, scripture is very insistent that private interpretation is forbidden. St. Peter said that the scriptures are difficult to understand and open to false interpretations:

"at the same time, we must be most careful to remember that the interpretation of scriptural prophecy is never a matter for the individual" (11 Peter 1 : 20); in the same epistle Peter warns : "There are certain passages in them (Paul's letters) hard to understand. The ignorant and the unstable distort them (just as they do the rest of scripture) to their own ruin". (11 Peter 3: 16).

St. Paul in his letter to the Galatians comes through very strongly on the point we are discussing : "Though an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema". (1: 8).

Some Protestants admit that Christ promised infallibility to the Apostles, but not to their successors (the Pope and bishops). But it is perfectly evident that He intended His Church to last to the end of the world and intended to teach future generations by means of the Magisterium He Himself established — "Behold I am with you (the Magisterium) all days till the end of the world". (Matt. 28: 18-20). Moreover, He told the first Magisterium : "I will ask the Father and He will give you another Paraclete that He may abide with you *forever*: the *Spirit of Truth* . . . He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you" (John 14: 16, 17, 26).

If the Magisterium of the Church could error, or if, as the Protestants affirm, each one must interpret the Bible for himself, Christ would have placed our salvation in jeopardy. We would never be really sure if we had the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Another point. If, as Protestants say, the Holy Spirit will lead each reader of the Bible to the truth, then the Holy Spirit has been contradicting Himself since the days of Luther. If each reader is "infallible" as Luther said, then each Protestant is his own Pope.

The various organs of opinion have reported reactions to Pope John Paul's social encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*. Opinions have been alternating between enthusiasm and support to the more negative and vituperative testimonies. It seems necessary to simply read (and as the Pope would say, reread) this landmark papal document. One particular objection, which has been raised with every social encyclical previously, is that the Holy Father is delving into an area (economic theory) in which he has no competence. In S.R.S., Pope John Paul II speaks to this matter directly :

"The Church does not have *technical solutions* to offer for the problem of underdevelopment as such, as Pope Paul VI already affirmed in his Encyclical. For the Church does not propose economic and political systems or programs, nor does she show preference for one or the other, provided that human dignity is properly respected and promoted, and provided she herself is allowed the room she needs to exercise her ministry in the world.

"But the Church is an "expert in humanity", and this leads her necessarily to extend her religious mission to the various fields in which men and women expend their efforts in search of the always relative happiness which is possible in this world, in line with their dignity as persons . (#41)"

We think the following article, reprinted from *The Light*, by Angela Grimm, a graduate of Thomas Aquinas College and director of the Catholic Center, provides same needed clarification on terms used by Pope John Paul II which have been misunderstood by various commentators. Acknowledgements and thanks to "Lay Witness", published by Catholics United for the Faith, 45 Union Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801, U.S.A.

Has John Paul Sold Out?

ANGELA GRIMM

THERE is always joy in being Catholic, if one works at it, but at times it is particularly pleasant to be able to make the assumptions of a Catholic. The Pope's new encyclical on social justice, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, is just such an occasion.

Even before reading it, the Catholic can have confidence in an encyclical. As an exercise of the common magisterium of the Church, we know it has the Holy Spirit's guidance. Headlines in the *New York Times* screamed "Papal Encyclical Says Superpowers Hurt Third World"; its excerpts and summaries alerted the *Washington Times*, William F. Buckley, and William Safire that the Pope had bought the moral equivalence argument. Safire even made the incredible claim that, "Pope John Paul II risks becoming known as the foremost political-moral relativist of our time". A number of our colleagues came to us demanding explanations of the "heresy" that our leader is spreading. The wonderful thing about being Catholic is that one knows they must be wrong. To say such a thing of the Pope is to disprove *ad absurdum* some other premise. One can say joyfully, "Magistra si!" with no other information than that the Pope wrote it. In short, the truth sets you free from doubts and worries about the possible cataclysmic results of the Pope's letter.

The truth, and the eyes of faith, also help one to read the text with understanding and profit. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* is very likely the most fully reasoned and profound of all social papal encyclicals. In it, John Paul II addresses social issues and problems with insight, objectivity, and subtlety, but most importantly, with truly impressive faith, charity, and authority. One cannot read it and remain uninspired.

The message of the encyclical, to distill it into a single phrase, is that everyone and every nation must consider himself his brother's keeper. His word for this relationship between men is solidarity. Obviously, solidarity is not a new idea. It has been part of the teaching of the Church

since Jesus Christ and perhaps Cain and Abel. Nor is there anything controversial about such a message, at least among Catholics. Controversy has arisen, however, around John Paul's reading of the signs of the times, and his application of the above principle. The reasons behind this controversy are partly semantic, though certainly not entirely so.

John Paul II is what many of our contemporary thinkers call "post-modern". While his orthodoxy is unquestionable, and his respect for tradition is plain, he is constantly striving to engage modern thought in the conversation between the magisterium and Church members and all men. He is following, very carefully, Pope John XXIII's recommendation to open a window into the Church. While many took this open window as an invitation to leave, John Paul is trying to encourage people to come in by the window. For that reason he often uses the terms of modern philosophies and trends, but with modified definitions. Whether he always succeeds rhetorically in co-opting this language to his (and the Gospel's) use is debatable, but it is important to the understanding of his writings not to confuse his use of, for example, liberation theology terminology for approval of liberation theology. His record on Communism, not to mention his guarantee of special guidance of the Holy Spirit, assures against that possibility.

Nor is it only for apologetic purposes that John Paul has engaged in this dialogue between modern philosophies, he has always sought, as a priest, a scholar and a bishop, to winnow the good from these philosophies, and put them at the service of Catholic theology. As a native of Poland, he is familiar not just with the theory and sometimes idyllic goals of German schools of thought, but also with the grim tragedies that resulted from their practice. In the words of Marx, he has been "through the fiery brook of Feuerbach", and his thinking and writing reflects that experience.

Reading *Sollicitudo* with this in mind, one will resist temptation to be alarmed at certain red-flag words which we usually find in the mouths of our political and theological opponents: "development", "structures of sin", and "distribution". The use of each of these words in the encyclical should be studied.

The encyclical also requires a certain amount of humility on the part of Americans. The Pope certainly never decries the U.S. by name, but he does hold both the East and the West up for a certain degree of censure. So far this has delighted the left wing in the U.S. and irritated the right. But if one reads the document carefully, the Pope is criticizing the West for the same reasons many on the right criticize it, and in many cases for things which do not apply to the United States. It is necessary therefore to study closely the analysis by which the Pope criticizes both East and West.

DEVELOPMENT

Sollicitudo Rei Socialis has been promulgated in commemoration of the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (Development of Peoples, 1967), and like the first, the new encyclical deals primarily with the question of development. Paul VI identified development as "the new name for peace"; John Paul II fleshes out this concept and assesses the progress that has been made in the twenty years since Paul's letter.

Lest anyone accuse the Church of promoting a utopian or Marxist view of human nature, the Pope makes it clear at the outset that development is not "a straightforward process, as it were automatic and in itself limitless, as though, given certain conditions, the human race were able to progress rapidly towards an undefined perfection of some kind". "Development", he says, is to be distinguished from the philosophical notion of "progress" that first arose in the Enlightenment period. The development desired by the Church is one based on the vocation given to man in the Garden of Eden.

Therefore the concept of development "is not limited to merely satisfying material necessities through an increase of goods", nor is it defined by technological and scientific advances. When development is achieved by these standards alone, the result is super-development, which "easily makes people slaves of 'possession' and of immediate gratification, with no other horizon than the multiplication or continual replacement of the things already owned with things still better". The problem does not lie in "having"

as such, as is clear by the fact that we consider it an injustice that so many "have" little or nothing, but "in possessing without regard for the *quality* and the ordered hierarchy of the goods one has. Quality and hierarchy rise from the subordination of goods and their availability to man's being' and his true vocation". (#29)

Authentic development, then, will respect and foster in man an awareness of the image of God in which he was made, and his responsibility for dominion over the earth. It must include and be formed by moral and cultural elements. It includes respect for the right to life, from conception to natural death; justice in employment relationships; religious freedom; respect for the right to education and to political autonomy.

To this list of rights, the Pope adds an entitlement which has never been recognized, at least in this way, in a Vatican document; the right of economic initiative, i.e., free enterprise.

... It is a right which is important not only for the individual but for the common good. Experience shows us that the denial of this right, or its limitation in the name of an alleged "equality" of everyone in society, diminishes, or in practice absolutely destroys the spirit of initiative ... As a consequence, there arises, not so much a true equality as a "leveling down". In the place of creative initiative there appears passivity, dependence and submission to the bureaucratic apparatus which, as the only "ordering" and "decision-making" body — if not also the only "owner"— of the entire totality of goods and the means of production, puts everyone in a position of almost absolute dependence

This is more than the customary defence of private property given in all social encyclicals. John Paul emphasizes here the ennobling effects of economic freedom and the superiority of free enterprise over socialism. But the Pope distinguishes, as have others before him (e.g., Chesterton, Belloc), between free enterprise and capitalism or as he puts it, liberal capitalism, which comes in for severe criticism later.

On the international level, development must take place within the context of respect for both individual human rights and "respect for the identity of each people, with its own historical and cultural characteristics". This would preclude, as the Pope makes specifically clear, programs which force population control methods contrary to the morals and traditions of the people as a prerequisite for aid to their country.

As part of his discussion of genuine development, John Paul II discusses the need for true stewardship over the earth, which has led some to dub this as the first encyclical on ecology. His admonishments here, however, are far from extreme — they will resonate with anyone with respect for God's beautifully varied creation, with prudence, or simply with a desire to live in a city in which they can breathe. His treatment of this subject is nothing other than a reminder that we do not own the earth, but have been given it for our wise use.

STRUCTURES OF SIN

Catholic writers have expended many words critiquing the expression "structures of sin" and the analysis behind it. Structures do not have intelligence or souls, therefore they cannot sin. It might seem more than a little embarrassing, then, for the Pope to come out in this encyclical speaking of sinful structures. His explanation of them, however, makes it clear that the sin, if there be any, inheres in individuals. Again, John Paul uses the words of leftist ideologues, but co-opts them to an orthodox view of the world and of human nature. This particular co-option is masterfully done.

Development has an essentially moral character because it affects the ability of men to fulfill their human and transcendent vocations. The obstacles to development, inasmuch as they are the result of human action likewise have a moral character. This is particularly the case when the obstacles are political in nature, since politics is pre-eminently a field of human choice and ethics. Political decisions, as well as economic ones, made without reference to the full meaning of authentic development, have led to

situations and conditions which of themselves perpetuate injustices and encourage sinfulness. To people who are accustomed to speaking of occasions of sin, this analysis is familiar. It is in this context that the Pope speaks of structures of sin, always understanding that the sin only lies with those who make such faulty decisions, and those who perpetuate the situation.

As specific examples of attitudes, of actions that might lead to such structures of sin, John Paul notes two: "the all consuming desire for profit" at any price, and "the thirst for power, with the intention of imposing one's will on others" at any price. He specifically declines to identify one of these faults with one bloc and the other to the other bloc. Rather, he says, they usually co-exist.

The Pope's own words best justify his introduction of the reference to "structures of sin" in his analysis of development.

I have wished to introduce this type of analysis above all in order to point out the true nature of the evil which faces us with respect to the development of peoples: it is a question of a moral evil, the fruit of many sins which lead to "structures of sin". To diagnose the evil in this way is to identify precisely, on the level of human conduct, the path to be followed in order to overcome it.

As long as the obstacles to development seem inevitable and not subject to moral judgment, they lie outside the realm of human responsibility, and outside the realm of human efficacy. The Pope brings the problem squarely within these realms, and, as he says, identifies the path to be followed in solving it. He thus shows men both that they are responsible for the problems, and that they are solvable by human action aided by God.

If some of the obstacles to development are the result of sin, then the solution is simple: conversion. And the virtue which needs to be fostered in this instance is one which is new in the catalogue of virtues—solidarity.

The Pope says many things about solidarity without ever precisely defining it. Solidarity is interdependence among individuals, peoples and nations, "a commitment to the good of one's neighbor". Stemming from concern for one's

neighbor is a commitment to the common good, "based on the principle that the goods of creation are meant for all". As the Pope notes, solidarity has much in common with Christian charity — one might say is an amalgam of justice and charity. As exemplars of solidarity in the modern world, John Paul recalls St. Peter Claver and St. Maximilian Kolbe, men who did not change the course of history, but who bore their neighbor's burdens as their own.

DISTRIBUTION

The above principle cited by the Pope, "that the goods of creation are meant for all", has concerned those who see in it a recommendation for the redistribution of wealth attempted in socialist systems. This concern is unfounded. As the Pope makes clear in several places in the encyclical, the Church is not recommending any particular program, nor is it recommending, even in principle, that there should be any specific attempts to equalize everyone's standard of living. His treatment of the right of economic initiative shows that he is aware of the problems of such attempts. Instead, he is calling for the same thing every pope since Leo XIII has called for: recognition of the dual purpose of wealth — one personal and the other social. As *Sollicitudo Socialis* puts it, "That which human industry produces through the processing of raw materials, with the contribution of work, must serve equally for the good of all". Whatever the mechanistic explanations might be, it is inarguable that many parts of the world do not enjoy the goods of creation, while other parts have an excess. This is undeniably a poor distribution of goods. To observe this is not to be in favor of anything resembling an international income tax. It is simply to say that we need to change some things which affect this uneven distribution.

MORAL EQUIVALENCE?

Perhaps the greatest obstacle to full acceptance of *Sollicitudo Socialis* by politically conservative Catholics is the perception that it somehow endorses or promotes the principle of moral equivalence, i.e., that there is no moral difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. This reading of the letter is unwarranted.

In a syndicated column Michael Novak noted that if the world were transformed according to the Pope's requirements, its structure would be very like the institutions of the United States, and he is probably right about this. But he cites this as proof that the Pope is inconsistent or misinformed to compare East and West. There is a faulty line of reasoning here. Nowhere in the text of the encyclical is the United States mentioned, nor even any mention of "superpowers", *New York Times* headlines notwithstanding. Whatever comparisons there are between the East and the West, to our Polish Pope, West is not a synonym for the United States. In a strict sense, there is no comparison here at all, since nothing is declared better, worse, or equal. Each is simply evaluated and found wanting. Let he who is perfect challenge this analysis.

The discussion of the East and the West arises in the Holy Father's assessment of development over the last twenty years. In noting that it has been either slow or non-existent in many parts of the world especially the southern hemisphere, he finds a partial explanation for this in the polarization that has existed and intensified since the Second World War between the Eastern and Western blocs. (He does not, however, exonerate the Third World countries from responsibility.) The opposition is political, but behind the political differences, there is as John Paul calls it, an ideological difference.

In the West there exists a system which is historically inspired by the principles of liberal capitalism which developed with industrialization during the last century. In the East there exists a system inspired by the Marxist collectivism which sprang from an interpretation of the condition of the proletarian classes made in the light of a particular reading of history. Each of these two ideologies, on the basis of two different visions of man and of his freedom and social role, has proposed and still promotes, on the economic level, antithetical forms of the organization of labor and the structures of ownership

Two things must be remembered in reading this. One, the United States is not mentioned by name here; and two, the U.S. was not founded on the principles of liberal capitalism, as it developed in the 19th century, or on the

principles of 18th century liberalism. This point is argued well by many scholars, including Tocqueville and, more recently, the Straussian school of political philosophy. To read "United States" wherever the Pope writes "West" is provincial and simply wrong. But some of the criticism of the West does apply to us. We were not unaffected by these strains of individualism which the Church condemns; nor is it difficult to recognize ourselves in the description of consumerist, throw-away societies. But there is certainly no point in wearing shoes that don't fit, and then complaining about it.

More than their theories of economics and politics, the Pope finds fault with the respective concepts of development that the East and West promote in the Third World. Both concepts of development, he says, are flawed and in need of radical correction. It should be noted, however, that although the Pope faults both the East and the West for allowing ideology to get in the way of true development of nations and people, the specific obstacles which he mentions are more often applicable to the Soviet bloc than to the West. For example, the Pope condemns suppression of economic initiative (which does sometimes happen in the West through oppressive tax laws, but is systemic in the communist bloc), one party, totalitarian political systems, and the extermination of whole peoples. One must note, however, that there are other charges that both blocks are guilty of, e.g., disregard for innocent human lives. While it is certainly no better in the communist bloc, we cannot ignore that 22 million children have been killed in this country since 1973.

CONSUMERIST SOCIETY

It has been argued that highlighting these faults of the United States or of the Western, free world will only enervate our will to resist Communism. It might be countered, however, that to a large degree we already have lost that will to resist evil, and for many of the reasons that the Pope highlights in this encyclical. Whatever the nobler aspects of our past may be, we are now a consumerist society, more concerned with compact disc players, Ralph Lauren designs and stero VCRs than with the violation of human rights at home and worldwide. When good capitalist, American

companies like Cheveron Oil see fit to make a profit by supporting a Marxist, oppressive regime in Angola, we have already lost the will to fight.

If anything, the Pope's encyclical should provide a new strategy for a world weary of entrenched conflict. After forty years of the Cold War, it is clear that such a new strategy for the hearts and minds of men is needed. However great the blessings of liberty may be for Americans and most Europeans, we have not done a very good job of securing them for other, less developed nations. Too often the United States has acted in developing countries without concern for the autonomy or culture of the indigenous people. Too often we have abandoned them to slaughter and oppression when it became economically or politically expedient to do so. In short, we have acted without solidarity. The result is not only anti-Western sentiment in the third World, but a lack of enthusiasm among our own young people, who see the struggle as being between two different forms of materialism. The western variety may be more pleasant to live in than dialectic materialism, but it's not worth dying for.

THE COMMON GOOD

If we follow that Pope's lead in building personal and international relationships and making decisions with the common good always in mind, we will have nothing to fear from the communist states. We will be offering to the world and our own youth a way of life that appeals to all aspects of human nature, and communism has nothing to offer in comparison. It is also a strategy that we will have to ourselves. There is not much hope that the Soviet Union will lead the way in embracing true solidarity and promoting authentic development. There probably won't be too many copies of this encyclical printed there.

Following the teachings of this encyclical will not entail a revolution in the United States, and the Pope knows that. It will require conversion and a different attitude about individual, national and international life. On the other hand, it might very well require revolution in the Soviet bloc, but I don't think this Pope expects that in the near future. Conversion might serve the same end there as well. That is what we pray for.

Book Review

THE POPULATION BOMB: FACT VERSUS FANCY

The War against Population by Jacqueline Kasun; Ignatius Press, San Francisco, U.S.A.; pp. 225; \$14.95.

It is good to find the Author of this splendid book quoting, in its first pages, the opinion of Colin Clark, one-time Director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute at Oxford University, to the effect that, in Kasun's words, "(Clark having) classified world land types by their food-raising capabilities . . . found that if all farmers were to use the best methods, enough food could be raised to provide an American-type diet for 35.1 billion people, more than seven times the present (world) population. Since the American diet is a very rich one, Clark found that it would be possible to feed three times as many again, or more than twenty-two times as many as now exist, at a Japanese standard of food intake. Clark's estimate assumed that nearly half of the earth's land area would remain in conservation areas, for recreation and the preservation of wild life" (op; cit. pp 34-35).

To my knowledge, Colin Clark has been a persistent advocate of this outlook, certainly since I had the pleasure and privilege of meeting him at Oxford when I was working with the Catholic Social Guild, which had its base there. I have had the pleasure of enjoying his friendship ever since. I admired then and have continued to admire ever since, not only the depth of his Catholic Faith, which underlay the internationally acknowledged prowess which distinguished his immense academic ability as a demographer and statistician of world repute. I still have to hand some notes taken from his calculations, which I took down years ago and have treasured ever since. Here they are.

In the first place, Clark has said that, if you put the inhabitants of the world in the United States, the density per square kilometer of the world population in that country would be 300 people — this, of course, at the

time he made the calculation. Yet, as he pointed out at the time, the Netherlands has a density of over 300 people per square kilometer and, at the same time, the Netherlands is a food-exporting country. Here, clearly, is an indication of what the application universally of a first-class agricultural technique could do. Secondly, Clark has estimated that, if the cultivable land of the earth were farmed at Dutch standards, it could support, in a very fair degree of comfort, 10 to 15 billion people as distinct from the mere 2.2 billion which it was supporting at the time he made this calculation.

Let me assure the reader that Clark's calculations are mentioned here, not by way of padding, but to give the reader confidence that, writing as Jacqueline Kasun does, in the teeth of massive academic and governmental pressure, particularly in the United States, what she advocates in her own book with such objectivity and courage, against a background of painstaking research, deserves whole-hearted assent, not only by reason of the intrinsic excellence and integrity of her writing, but also because the line she takes is directly related to the research and the writings of Colin Clark. In Clark's time, the world was caught by Castro's (not Fidel) *Geography of Hunger*. In Jacqueline Kasun's time, which is today, the "population bomb" has found a similar massive following of those—at academic and popular level—whom one can only describe as "suckers" in this regard. And there can be none greater at the moment than those who compose what one can describe as the Antinatal Establishment in the United States. According to Clark and Jacqueline Kasun these are flying in the face of the facts as they truly are; disregarding the earth's potential, as it truly is; as such, failing to see the source of what they think of as the coming disaster of over-population as man-made, not as inset within the productivity of nature itself. The arrogance of the academics prevents them from acknowledging the former likelihood; makes them quick to point a finger at what they think of in their ignorance as the paucity of the earth's resources; hence, to the proposition (quite false) that God (if they go so far as to acknowledge his existence) has failed his people.

G. K. Chesterton summed it all up years ago. "If", the great man said, "you have ten heads and nine top-hats to fit them, the thing to do is to make one more hat, not to cut off one head". That is the advice—thoroughly Christian, objective and sound that Jacqueline Kasun, like Colin Clark before her, follows so bravely and so brilliantly in her splendid work.

— Paul Crane, S.J.

THE INJURED CHILD

Oh I smiled at the child
With the bandaged head,
But she quietly stood
And just looked ahead.

How the sight of this child
In her sad despair
Made me try to say
Such a fervent prayer.

Then I looked at the child
With the bandaged head,
And I thought she smiled
When the prayer was said.



N. Racine-Jaques, 1987

FR. CLIFFORD'S PILGRIMAGES 1989

1) LOURDES? TORRECIUDAD? MONSERRAT

8 Days Air to Lourdes. 3 Nights Lourdes, then Coach.
1 Night Pamplona; 2 Nights Torreciudad. 1 Night
Perpignan. Full Board Lourdes; $\frac{1}{2}$ Board on Tour.

Depart Gatwick May 27th.

2) PILGRIMAGE/HOLIDAY TO SEEFELD IN AUSTRIA

Depart London by coach on Friday, August 4th; re-
turn Sunday, August 13th. (One night each way in
Germany). Visits include Oberammergau, Munich,
Innsbruck and Dolomites.

£260 $\frac{1}{2}$ Board.

Both prices yet to be confirmed.

Apply to

REV. MICHAEL CLIFTON,
30 Park Road, Colliers Wood, London SW19 2HS
Phone P1-540-3057